

Attachment 1 to Memorandum

Summary of Comments Received as of August 29, 2014

As stated in the Board Report, the Authority held an amended scoping period for the Palmdale to Burbank and Burbank Los Angeles Sections of the project starting in July of 2014. This document summarizes the comments received as of August 31, 2014, consistent with the originally stated scoping period. While the Authority extended the scoping period through September 12, 2014, those comments are not all reflected in this summary document, but will be incorporated in the final scoping reports for these sections. By August 31, 2014 approximately 580 comment letters were received from concerned members of the public and from organizations and agencies with an interest in the development of the HSR System. All comments received will help the Authority to identify a reasonable range of alternatives and analyze potential impacts on communities and the environment. These impacts would be studied at length through the environmental process with the objective to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate to the greatest extent feasible.

The following agencies and elected officials submitted scoping comments as of August 29, 2014:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (P-B and B-LA)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (P-B)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (B-LA)
- California Assemblyman Wilk, 38th District (P-B)
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (P-B and B-LA)
- California Department of Parks and Recreation (B-LA)
- California Department of Transportation (B-LA)
- California Department of Conservation (P-B)
- California State Lands Commission (P-B and B-LA)
- California Department of Water Resources (P-B)
- State Water Resources Control Board (P-B and B-LA)
- Native American Heritage Commission (P-B and B-LA)
- Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority (P-B)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (P-B and B-LA)
- Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (P-B)
- Los Angeles County Public Works Department (P-B and B-LA)
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (B-LA)
- Metropolitan Water District (P-B and B-LA)
- City of Los Angeles Planning Department (P-B and B-LA)
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (P-B)
- City of Los Angeles Councilmember Fuentes, Seventh District (P-B)
- City of Los Angeles Councilmember Martinez, Sixth District (P-B)
- City of Santa Clarita Mayor West (P-B)

- City of San Fernando City Manager (P-B)
- City of Burbank City Council (P-B and B-LA)

Key Issues Identified in Agency Comments for the Palmdale to Burbank Section

- The direct alternative between Palmdale and Burbank has the potential to reduce community and environmental impacts. Tunnels may help to avoid and reduce impacts.
- Additional alternatives should be evaluated to determine if they have the potential to result in fewer environmental and community impacts while providing time savings to the system, including alternatives that surface away from residential neighborhoods and additional alternatives along San Fernando Road.
- The impacts of tunnels should be addressed. These impacts may include impacts on stream flows and groundwater; impacts on waters of the U.S; and impacts on wildlife and sensitive ecosystems.
- Impacts due to construction access and maintenance of tunnels should be evaluated thoroughly. The locations of staging, storage, and disposal areas should be assessed.
- Environmental justice in minority and low income populations should be addressed.
- Native American consultation should be completed and effects on archaeological resources should be addressed.
- Impacts on fully protected species, special status plant species, Joshua Tree habitat, special status avian species, and desert tortoise should be addressed.
- Wetland habitat values and acreage, and surface water function and value, should be addressed.
- Impacts on the Santa Clara River corridor should be addressed, including potential impacts on biological resources.
- Impacts on the Tujunga Wash should be addressed
- Impacts on wildlife movements and wildlife corridors and should be addressed,
- Impacts on conservation areas should be addressed.
- Impacts on air quality, noise, drainage patterns, growth inducement and cumulative impacts should be addressed.
- Construction impacts and post-construction surface water management should be addressed.
- Any impacts on Bob Hope Airport should be addressed, including the relationship to future airport terminal projects.
- Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFD) facilities, flood control features, and flood fighting ability should not be impeded.
- Any effects on the Metropolitan Water District's Santa Monica Feeder pipeline, East Valley Feeder pipeline, and Balboa Inlet Tunnel should be addressed.
- FRA and the Authority should coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to address any potential effects on Corps facilities.
- Potential impacts associated with valley ever should be addressed

Key Issues Identified in Agency Comments for the Burbank to Los Angeles Section

- Environmental justice in minority and low income populations should be addressed.
- Impacts on residential areas, including noise and visual impacts and connectivity with street, pedestrian, and bicycle connections, should be addressed.
- Impacts on businesses and cultural resources should be addressed.
- The connection to Los Angeles Union Station should be coordinated and consistent with other improvements in the vicinity.
- Impacts on restoration and mitigation areas, including the Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration, should be addressed.
- Impacts on sensitive species, movement corridors, and habitats along the Los Angeles River and in Elysian Park should be addressed.
- Trail and access connectivity along the Los Angeles River should be addressed.
- Impacts on waters of the U.S, air quality, noise, transportation and traffic, induced growth, and cumulative impacts should be addressed.
- Any potential effects on flood protection facilities should be addressed.
- The additional infrastructure needed to support the Initial Operating Section terminus in Burbank should be considered and advance funding of infrastructure with independent utility should be considered.
- Impacts on and benefits to goods movement should be evaluated.
- Any effects on the Santa Monica Feeder water pipeline should be addressed.
- Elevated rail should be considered as a means of reducing surface impacts.
- Potential impacts associated with valley fever should be addressed.
- Impacts to communities along the banks of the Los Angeles River should be addressed.

Key Issues Identified in Public Comments

While few public comments focused on the issue of dividing the Palmdale-Los Angeles section into two independent sections, many comments address the proposed addition of a more direct alternative between Palmdale and Burbank (Alternative Corridor). Comments indicate that there is strong interest in and support for the consideration of this alternative in the northern San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita, Palmdale, and parts of Agua Dulce and Acton, there was concern, and some opposition from parts of Acton, and areas along the southern slopes of the Angeles National Forest, as follows:

- Comments supporting further study of the Alternative Corridor note that it is shorter and would potentially reduce the travel time between Palmdale and Burbank, address potential impacts that could be avoided or reduced by this alternative, including the potential to reduce impacts on existing communities, homes, sensitive ecological areas, and historical and archeological sites, and support the use of tunneling in the Alternative Corridor to reduce potential impacts.

- Comments concerned about or opposing the Alternative Corridor specifically highlight possible impacts on existing properties and communities, request additional study of a range of impacts, including impacts on Angeles National Forest, effects on sensitive species, impacts on groundwater and surface water, and impacts on flood control facilities impacts on recreation facilities, and effects on legislative and administrative consideration of Angeles National Forest for further federal protection as a national monument or recreation area.

In addition, public comments raised a wide range of concerns and questions including:

- Comments on the P-B section addressed issues including impacts on residences and property values, potential community disruption, impacts on water quality and quantity, impacts on sensitive ecosystems and wildlife, seismic issues, and noise and visual impacts.
- Comments on the B-LA section addressed issues including impacts on residences and property values, impacts on the Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Project, noise and vibration, visual impacts, safety, and construction.
- Comments on the potential noise impacts addressed the methodology used for the analysis
- Comments concerned about the potential impacts on residential wells, the quality, production rate and the cost to replace or mitigate these impacts
- Comments on potential vibration impacts when tunneling
- Comments on concerns about tunneling under a water source or a flood plain